

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/501,638	OKADA, TAIICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jenna-Leigh Johnson	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTO-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to the response filed on October 7, 2008.
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1,2,4,5 and 11.
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some* c) None of the:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____.
7. Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. Other _____.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Josh Ryan on December 22, 2008.

The application has been amended as follows:

In Claim 1, line 5, after "is at most", replace "3/m" with --2/m--.

In Claim 11, line 5, after "is at most", replace "3/m" with --2/m--.

In Claim 11, line 1, after "consisting of a", insert --silicone--.

2. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

3. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed September 9, 2008 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 11 based upon JP 07-252740 A in view of Kami et al. (6,283,507). The declaration, in combination with example 5 in the specification, compares how the number of entanglements in the yarns and the tension used during the weaving process, which removes entanglements from the yarns, produces different number of entanglements in the yarn in the woven fabric. And the coated fabrics having yarns with two or less entanglements per meter have improved performance with regards to the claimed horizontal index property, fabric and airbag thickness, and fabric stiffness. JP 07-252740 A does not teach using tensions which remove a sufficient amount of entanglements from the yarns so that the yarns in the woven fabric have an entanglement of at most 2 per meter, it would not have the improved properties. Further, as set forth in the declaration filed on February 5, 2007, the amount of tension used to remove a significant number of entanglements is significantly higher (0.5cN/dtex) than the standard amounts of tension (0.2cN/dtex) used in the art to weave airbag fabrics. And without a teaching to remove the entanglements or purposefully use yarns with a low

number of entanglements, it would not be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to produce the claimed number of entanglements or the claimed horizontal index.

4. The prior art fails to teach or fairly suggest a coated airbag fabric with a resin coating applied to a base fabric in an amount of 5 to 20 g/m², as claimed, wherein the base fabric is formed from yarns having the claimed flattened cross-section yarns, and the number of entanglements in the warp and weft yarns of the base fabric is at most 2/m and the filaments in the yarn are aligned in the base fabric such that the total average horizontal index fall within a range of 0.75 to 1.0. While the prior art suggests coated airbags, with the claimed amount of resin and airbags made from similar flattened cross-section yarns. The prior art fails to teach using yarns with such a low number of entanglements, as claimed, or using a weaving process with a higher than standard tension, which would function to positively remove entanglements from the yarns as they are woven into the base fabric. And, as shown in the declaration the higher number of entanglements in the yarns of the comparative examples prevent the filaments in the base fabric from having the claimed horizontal index.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenna-Leigh Johnson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1472. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 - 5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jlj
December 22, 2008

/Jenna-Leigh Johnson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794